

Cooperative Monitoring Evaluation and Research (CMER) Meeting Notes

6-05-01

June 5 – CMER Meeting

Meeting Agenda:

- 1) 5-year spending plan
- 2) Project status update
- 3) Multi-year projects and funding needs
- 4) Project prioritization process
- 5) CMER Staffing
- 6) FFR Task list
- 7) CMER/DNR Relationship Cooperation
- 8) Equipment Needs
- 9) Monitoring Design Team
- 10) Contractor Selection
- 11) CMER Website Progress
- 12) Watershed Analysis

Tim Quinn opened the meeting and asked if there were any amendments to the minutes of the last CMER meeting. There were no amendments raised and the minutes were adopted.

1) FIVE-YEAR SPENDING PLAN

Federal Fiscal year does not coincide with the State Fiscal year, one year contract extension on federal funds. Budget is still not finalized by Legislature. Federal forests and fish dollars coming from Congress through the State Salmon Recovery Board through the Interagency Committee via a contract with DNR. \$197k for Dept. of Ecology Monitoring Design Team work. 1.412 million for CMER and Monitoring. \$794k not allocated yet. Some of this year's money will be available through June 30th, 2003.

Handout- 5-year spending plan for CMER- Fiscal Year 2002. Some money can be carried beyond 2002. This is really a 4-year spending plan. Question: Can this money be carried forward to 2006. Yes. Ask for a 3 year contract. There will be changes to this document (handout) and it should be considered a dynamic document.

SAGS need to differentiate between single and multi-year projects. Message from policy-Plan for longer than 1-year. Think long term.

2 & 3) PROJECT STATUS UPDATE AND MULTI-YEAR FUNDING NEEDS

Bull-Trout SAG:

Eastside bull-trout overlay comparison study:

Cooperative Monitoring Evaluation and Research (CMER) Meeting Notes

6-05-01

Peer Review by Bob Beschta needs RSAG and BTSAG review, plus a statistical review by Bob Conrad. There is an RFQQ proposed once peer reviews are completed.. Project needs funding at 200k for 1-year of sampling. \$125k for 2002, \$85k for 2003, 2004 & 2005 for resampling.

Temperature/Nomograph Study:

RFQQ is out on Dept.of Interior website. Bidding closes on June 22, 2001. Evaluation team will be set up. RSAG will manage study. Does SAGE group want to manage eastside part of the study? Entire project will be done under RSAG. Two contracts could be done, but one contract would be more efficient. SAGE wants involvement but no lead. Phase 1 eastside, Phase 2 westside. Going out as one bid. \$85k will cover cost for both. This is a one-year study.

Eastern Washington RFP for temperature/nomograph study has gone out. CMER needs justification from SAG on recommendation for no peer review.

Conceptual Groundwater Model:

On same schedule as temperature/nomograph study (June 22nd, 2001) bidding closes. RFQQ on Dept. of Interior website. Question raised about RFQQ distribution list. Need for outyear funding- Some need for future funding.

Bull-trout radiotelemetry:

\$50k needed for equipment purchase. \$25k listed in spreadsheet. This is a one-year cost, no future funding needed.

Eastside bull-trout overlay comparison study (revisited):

\$125k is including additional monies for solar radiation study. Solar radiation/canopy cover issue. Workgroup will reconvene to set up paired instruments in treatment/control design. This work will be done on existing bull-trout overlay sites. \$100k for overlay, \$25k for solar radiation/temperature study. CMER suggested these be put into two different contracts. Last fish habitat to ISAG. Type N & F streams project to RSAG.

Should there be a record for peer review decisions and a companion response document from CMER agreeing or not agreeing with the SAG recommendations? Need to have in writing from SAGS their recommendations on peer review. SAG project leads must keep documentation and forward to CMER administrator. SAGs should send a memo to CMER on recommendations for peer review for study design etc. CMER response to SAGS recorded in meeting minutes. Where should official records reside? With the CMER administrator.

ISAG:

Cooperative Monitoring Evaluation and Research (CMER) Meeting Notes**6-05-01****Stream typing model development:**

Project is 30% complete.. Target date end of July for the statistical group to pick-up. Eastern Washington field data collection this summer. Shared project schedule with Forest Practices Board. Model implementation for western Washington done June of next year, June of 2003 for eastern Washington. Terrapin is the contractor for the eastside. Adjust budget sheet- higher by \$70k-\$80k. Out-year funding needs: \$100k per year through 2003. Westside maps will be made available first, eastside maps second, they will be distributed when they are ready.

RSAG:**Nomograph study:**

USFWS/RSAG \$85k for 2002. One-year contract.

DFC Project:

DFC validation pilot study completed. Conducting analysis and interpretation of data from pilot. Sampling design and sample size variability high. Site-class not a good classification strata. SAG needs to evaluate and conclude pilot findings. Rough projections for budget: \$200k for 2002, \$200k for 2003. Will \$200k be spent within 2002 Fiscal Year? Yes. Cost depends on sample size. Contract with Duck Creek Associates to analyze increment cores to document ages of stands, how trees have grown over their life span. Part of DFC project which goes toward validating stand condition assumptions.

Type N & F effectiveness study:

Experimental design workgroup making slow progress. Project will be launched more completely in 2002 fiscal year. Need full-time staff person to manage project. This is a long term project 5-10 years. \$75k for 2002 fiscal year, \$100k for 2003 fiscal year, \$150 k for 2004 fiscal year and \$200k for each of the next 2 years to 2006 fiscal year.

Temperature Workshop:

Draft proceedings have been distributed.

DFC Documentation Contract:

Project conducted by Steve McConnell at the NWIFC: focus on policy development of the DFC model. \$6k-\$7k cost. Is there a project description? Yes, look in contract under deliverables.

WETSAG:**Forested Wetland Literature Review:**

Cooperative Monitoring Evaluation and Research (CMER) Meeting Notes

6-05-01

One funded project with a need for \$25k in 2002 fiscal year (Forested Wetland Literature Review). Recommendation from WETSAG that literature review project does not need peer review. CMER voted and concurred with WETSAG that this project does not need peer review.

UPSAG:

PIP Project:

Three points: 1. Compile existing data and analyze. 2. Additional data analysis in coordination with SAGE. 3. Re-analyze. Develop common field protocol. No idea of budget needs for 2002. May be a multi-year project. Curt Veldhuisen in coordinating a pip-data summit. Need \$70k for 2003 fiscal year. Suggestion from CMER that field study needs to happen this summer to sample drought conditions.

Road Project:

Road program RMAP effectiveness is wrapped up in staff position. \$41k of Dept. of Ecology Direct Implementation Fund (DIF) money was to fund 60% of staff geomorphologist position. Questioning priorities. Take \$41k for a contractor to work with UPSAG on Roads Project. Need \$41k to move program and fully fund CMER staff geomorphologist. Bulk of work coordinating with DNR to develop a common strategy for adaptive management of RMAP effectiveness monitoring. Done this fiscal year.

Will be a monitoring program for roads through 2005. Need more than \$50k per year.

There will be presentations on road surface erosion modeling by Walt Megahan, Steve Toth and a presentation on DSHVM from 12-4 pm at the Rayonier Seatac offices on June 14th.

SAGE:

PIP:

Protocol and study plan. We have no data to evaluate. Deferring to UPSAG pip project. Who is the official project lead for this project?? Domoni Glass and Pete Peterson. PIP budget: \$25k this fiscal year and big \$ in another year. CMER suggests that SAGE ask for more money for this project. \$75k for 2002, \$100k for 2003. These are interim projects until more comprehensive study on basin area relationships can be completed. UCUTs are funding data collection for PIPs, are you coordinating with that effort. Yes. They are committed to do work on reservation this year. Lack of a common field protocol a problem-need to coordinate with CMER on this.

Eastside disturbance regime project:

\$80k in 2001 for literature review and gap analysis. Study design development. Major effort for next year requires \$800k. Similar to DFC project. Scoping meeting June 11th. Agenda item for

Cooperative Monitoring Evaluation and Research (CMER) Meeting Notes

6-05-01

next CMER meeting, is \$80k appropriate for 2002, \$300k 3 years.

Workshops:

Finished second workshop on eastside disturbance. Question whether or not a white paper from the first workshop should be produced. DNR commitment has been met but if a white paper is needed that could be folded into \$80k work and come out with a finished product. Need for staffing-contract and project manager. Don't really know the need at this point.

LWAG:

Projects proceeding as planned. Drought causing problems.

RMZ resampling:

Budget needs, \$165.1k in 2002, increase by \$326k in 2003, \$244k in 2004, \$53k in 2005. RMZ resample peer review not needed. RFP drafted for comments. Discussion of RMZ re-sampling add ons in proposal review. Need memo from LWAG to CMER on justification for no peer review. Tim Quinn: need more specificity in RFP. Add in L1 questions and cost proposal, keep separate from original study. Sites should fit into effectiveness study. Baseline for F&N study. Tim Quinn: Figure out specific questions up front. Do we need to defer this study until overall effectiveness design is ready? Leave out L1 questions? Co-chair wants study design review of RMZ sampling project. How many methods have been called into question? Bats and amphibians on study design replication, SAG suggest no peer review. Does CMER agree?

Options

1. Yes, CMER agrees.
2. No, CMER does not agree-need peer review.
3. Return to LWAG and revisit decision to recommend no study review.

Tim Quinn: Cost/Risk, this project has high cost and high risk. Could we allocate funds based on review of RFP?

Defer this until RFP is finished.

Need a cost breakdown, frame for CMER what parts could be dropped.

*CMER recommends this project goes back to LWAG to review comments on RFP.

CMER asked for vote on original recommendation for no peer review. No response from the committee was received.

CMER asked if group thought project should go back to LWAG for review. CMER received a

Cooperative Monitoring Evaluation and Research (CMER) Meeting Notes

6-05-01

yes response. Written recommendation partitioned into major headings within study and comments on RFP. Comments on RFP due in a week. ASAP.. Comments on RFP due before June 15th.

Seep characterization sampling methods study:

Budget needs: 2002 \$150k, and then \$150k annually for an indefinite time.

4) PROJECT PRIORITIZATION PROCESS

Discussion to improve process for next round of project priorities. Tim Quinn, Doug Martin and Jeff Grizzel will meet to develop the process for the next round. What didn't we like about the process used last round? Detailed workplan with budget projected for the next n years. Perhaps SAGS should not prioritize, but bring projects to CMER. SAGS bring forward projects that they think they can implement within the biennium.

SAGS should bring a list of launchable projects for fiscal year 02-03. SAGS should prioritize, level of detail should include out year funding.

Should CMER put more resources into fewer projects that would be completed sooner? Projects that are time dependent and deal breakers for the services. Put to SAGS to decide if funding is a bottleneck. How can SAGS accelerate projects. What is the limiting process?

Small facilitation projects can be funded with personal services contracts. Larger amounts need CMER discussion. Time certain/deal contingent projects. L1.b list. \$100k for operational funds, up to \$20k per request. Complete list plus list of projects that can be launched in 02-03 fiscal year, with project description and costs.

Grizzel, Quinn, Martin will request \$100k for project development fund from Policy.

*Monitoring Design Team needs \$60 k for Atterbury coverage of private ownership. CMER approves.

5) CMER STAFFING NEEDS

SAGS could use some staff time to take care of administrative tasks. Question for policy- Can we spend money to oversee projects?

UPSAG:

Cooperative Monitoring Evaluation and Research (CMER) Meeting Notes

6-05-01

CMER staff geomorphologist, CMER staff data manager and contract officer. Data management- need broad scoping instead of hiring data manager. Coordinate with DNR on road data. Ambient monitoring data- could be re-analyzed. We need to look at CMER data management needs.

RSAG:

Keep staff person we have and use Dave Schuett-Hames part time. Type F&N full time staff person.

SAGE:

\$20k fund for discrete project development will be sufficient.

6) FOREST AND FISH TASK LIST

SAGS need to give list to Jeff Grizzel.

7) CMER/DNR RELATIONSHIP-COOPERATION

Message from Policy: CMER and DNR work issues out at the CMER level and don't bring them to Policy. Discussion of peer review for TFW 118 project. CMER decided that three blind reviews either at the UPSAG level or through the Scientific Review Committee need to be done. Leave open the question of CMER funding for revision of TFW 118 based on peer review comments.

8) EQUIPMENT NEEDS

CMER equipment will be allocated on the following basis:

1. On-going projects
2. L1 question related, but not funded.
3. Cooperators, not L1 related.

9) CONTRACTOR SELECTION

ISAG Project-CMER project collecting additional data for Eastern Washington data. Study plan no peer review, evaluation team reviewed five proposals and selected a contractor. Questions about whether all five contractors were given the same information.

Cooperative Monitoring Evaluation and Research (CMER) Meeting Notes**6-05-01**

a. When a SAG goes out for an RFP or RFQQ they must agree on the approach they want used (i.e., Study design/approach).

b. Need a facilitator during the proposal review process.

Discussion of conflict of interest issues, eligibility to bid on projects, blind review of proposals.

10) CMER WEBSITE

Should CMER consider creating a CMER website. Heather Rowton at WFPA is compiling info currently. Should CMER hire a contractor to develop a website to be housed at DNR which the DNR contract administrator would maintain.

11) WATERSHED ANALYSIS

Insufficient time to deal with this item. Carry over to next meeting.

Next CMER Meeting scheduled for July 12th. Time and place to be announced.